The Assises des Déchets in Nantes of October 2 and 3 will explore the burning “waste planet” issue. Debates will in particular be concentrated on the priority given to prevention, inducing its consequences on the economy of waste management and treatment systems, and testimony will be given both from a local point of view by Michèle Gressus, vice-president of Nantes Métropole, and by Roberto Cavallo, president of an Italian co-op. Enlightened by international examples, industrial waste will equally be at the heart of the debate, reflected by the Copidec in Wallonia, but also by the capacity of activity development generated by their treatment, as illustrated by the dismantlement of nuclear facilities.
How are prevention and treatment structured at a local level?

Municipal waste management has greatly evolved during the last decades, and it is still developing: from a very simple system, conceived to get rid of waste - household waste-flows stored on a rubbish heap or valorised - to a far more elaborated “multi-flow and multi-tool” waste management system. It should be emphasized that there has been a radical mutation represented by the introduction of selective waste collection during the 80’s, and also a drastic evolution of treatment rules that have brought along a surge of tool performance. This system will continue to thoroughly evolve, in particular with the new demand for prevention, which will challenge the implemented systems.

What are the guidelines for reflection?

The authorities have started to think this over, in order to exceed these contradictions. They interrogate for instance planning tools, whose nature and perimeter could be adapted. Moreover, the interrogation of the territorial authorities is serious, knowing that certain zones still have treatment under-capacity, whereas others risk overcapacity, which naturally leads to the track of flow transfer… but endangers the principle of proximity! We shall also have to think about contractual and economical arrangements, knowing that pilot waste management and treatment systems need to be reinvented for a major part. In any case, this is the new challenge for local authorities they shall have to face in their mission of public proximity service implementation, by participating on a local level in the major issues of sustainable development.
To develop prevention without creating imbalances, there is no doubt that European guidelines should be followed, in particular Articles 9 and 29 of the Framework Directive 98/2008/CE requiring from member states to set up waste management programmes incorporating prevention and preparation for their reuse and thus anticipating challenges in terms of treatment, material recovery, energy recovery, burial capacities of facilities, and planning their developments.

Although facilities are already in place, the time for depreciation on investments should also be considered and, if need be, perspectives in terms of cooperation between neighbouring territories and regions should be evaluated, in order to identify an optimum geographic area that will allow for the introduction of prevention measures in future plans.

In any case, the key word is flexibility.

In treatment facilities schemes, technologies to modulate capacities and change the type of treatment, at least partially, when it will be necessary, should be selected. It is for example the case of mechanic and biologic treatment centres: in a first phase, they can treat a certain amount of urban waste; once selective collection has been improved, they can be transformed into aerobic composting centres with little investment.

It is very important to use the same methodological approach for the collection system. A door-to-door system should thus aim at the reduction of collection frequencies, which may be a fortunate consequence of the reduction of quantities to collect, to be obtained by means of various actions, including a prevention plan.

It appears as a whole that the close link between collection, transportation, treatment and contract on the one hand and tax system on the other hand should be taken into account. Full economic and financial balance will be reached only if planning incorporates the various levels. On a technical point of view, flexibility for example requires collection or facility management agreements with periodically renegotiable fees. As far as citizens or users are concerned, to the contrary, tax levies should also have a variable component that would take into account actually produced amounts of waste and the evolution of selective collection rates.

Therefore, flexibility is indeed the key word: flexibility of facilities, of technologies, of organisations, of geographic areas, of funding methods…
In Wallonia, the issue of construction inert waste management has been proactively addressed. But despite noticeable successes, recycling is still facing serious hindrances. Roger Croughs, honorary chairman of the Copidec, Conférence Permanente des Intercommunales Wallonnes de Gestion des Déchets delivers his analysis.

How were construction waste recycling efforts in Wallonia organised?

In Wallonia, the inert waste management policy is an integral part of the overall management of both municipal and industrial waste. As a result of regionalisation, competence for environment protection lies almost exclusively with regions, deriving from the EU directives, in particular in terms of hierarchy of management methods (prevention, reuse, recycling, energy recovery and elimination of the minimum ultimate residual waste). As far as construction waste is concerned, this political will was reflected in the promotion of the use of recycled products to preserve natural resources, i.e. very concretely, at a regulatory level, in the introduction of stringent conditions for the construction industry, including a ban on the disposal of some waste in technical burial centres (Centres d’enfouissement technique, CET), an incentive tax decree and a CET regional plan introduced in 1999.

What results have been achieved?

All such provisions have radically reduced the amount of construction waste buried in CETs, with now a very low fraction of them being admitted in Class-3 CETs. The industry adapted well to this obligation. For instance, 45 inert waste recycling centres were authorised in 1999, versus 226 in 2012. This is however no seamless process, including on an economic point of view. Hindrances are indeed very strong, in the first place because the production of recycled aggregates is now very high, but also because the economic crisis has been directly affecting the construction industry. Except for some regions, competition with producers of natural aggregates is not as significant as it used to be, as some of them have found their place on the market. The cost of transportation of aggregates from production sites to treatment sites, on the other hand, is an extremely important external element. Recyclers’ current situation however remains highly challenging overall, with very significant amounts of stored material and, of course, substantial financial impacts.
What actions have been taken to change the situation?

As mentioned above, the Wallonia’s government has been implementing a promising recycling policy, but ironically, results have not quite met our expectations. To try to change this situation, we need to act on several levels:

- Most importantly, we need to carry on efforts to further improve the quality of recycled products and thus to pursue the evolution of techniques, within the framework of the transposition of the EU Directive for “construction products” (89/106/EEC), so that “CE2+” products are not marketed any more;
- We should also carry on the work in technical commissions to change model specifications, without trying to compete with natural aggregates for the most noble applications. There should be enough room for all on the market!
- We should also continue to implement pilot projects at a minimum cost;
- We should at last stop referring to “recyclable inert waste” and rather speak of “recycled products”. But to that aim, it is indispensable for all producers to comply with applicable quality standards.

The media support the 12e Assises des DÉchets

“Collectively prepare and organize”: this question, which today mobilizes the nuclear facilities dismantling sector, will be at the core of an Assises workshop. With one implicit issue: is the French industry prepared to manage future dismantling? A review with Bruno Cahen, industrial manager of the Andra and session leader of workshop 8.

Why this mobilization around dismantling?
Because it is at the same time an urgent and a sustainable issue. Whatever the choices of energy policy, the industrial activities in connection with nuclear facilities in France and in the majority of nuclearized countries will include an ever more significant dismantling chapter. Henceforth, each operator of a nuclear facility will have to plan all aspects of lifecycle management: dismantling criteria integrated in the authorization request file, strategy and financing of waste periodically valuated… The technological, industrial, financial and societal stakes are high, so it is only natural to insure that the industry is ready to manage future dismantling.

Is the horizon also technological?
Yes, the necessity to innovate will undoubtedly be added to planning and organisational issues. The industrial, societal and research stakes connected with dismantling are linked with the limitation of the received doses, the time schedule, the cost and the operational hazards as well as those related to the necessity to insure the availability of finances, competence and techniques for operations during the next decades. As far as waste is concerned, volume reduction, characterization of waste “in situ” and dismantling techniques, waste sorting, handling and conditioning for an optimized storage or recycling are some of the many fields of innovation in this sector of the future, in France and abroad.
WEDNESDAY 2nd October 2013

09.00 am Welcome of participants

10.00 am Opening of the conference
   Welcome speeches

10.30 am Intervention of a personality

11.00 am Debate in plenary session: PS1
   What are the results of the 2009-2013, Waste Plan so far?

12.30 am Lunch

2.00 pm Debate in plenary session: PS2
   Is hierarchy in prevention needed

3.30 pm Break

4 to 6.00 pm Parallel Technical Workshops:
   1. Statistics: a public policy tool to improve?
   2. Treatment capacities: a new sizing pattern
   3. Recycling: proximity versus industrialisation?
   4. How can organic waste be (properly) recovered?

8.30 pm Dinner

Thursday 3rd October 2013

8.30 am Parallel Technical Workshops:
   5. Waste from building sites: a resource that needs to be explored
   6. Energy recovery perspectives
   7. Technologies: the new potentials that can be exploited
   8. Nuclear facilities: dismantling and lifecycle-related challenges

10.30 am Break

11.00 am Debate in plenary session: PS3
   Superposition of plans threatens coherence

12.30 am Lunch

2.00 pm Debate in plenary session: PS4
   Challenges and propositions for the future

3.30 pm Intervention of the Minister of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy

4.00 pm Closure of the Assises